

THE CRISIS.

Devoted to the Support of the Democratic Principles of Jefferson.

"Union, harmony, self-denial, concession---everything for the Cause, nothing for Men."

No. 32.

RICHMOND, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1840.

VOL. I.

TERMS.

THE CRISIS will be printed in quarto form, on a medium sheet, with new type. The price \$1--and no paper will be sent to any person, without payment in advance, postage paid. As nothing short of a very large and effective subscription can justify the continuation of the paper, the above terms will be strictly adhered to. We mean to make no debts at all. We abjure all credit in this establishment, and insist upon the Cash System.

POLITICAL.

HARRISON AND ABOLITIONISM.

In order to understand this matter fully, it will be necessary to look back for a period of near fifty years; for, it is near that time since General Harrison, as he states, became a member of an Abolition Society, then existing in Virginia, the President of which, he says, was Mr. Robert Pleasants, a copy of the Constitution of which is here given, together with a section of a law passed by the Virginia Legislature in 1797, which will shew what was the character of that institution and in what estimation its members were held at the time in Virginia.

We might proceed to shew that Harrison's nomination was procured by the Abolitionists; and in order to establish the fact, we might give extracts from the confidential circular said to be gotten up by the Central Abolition Committee at Albany, preceding the Harrisburg Convention, and which was directed by S. Dewitt Bloodgood, a leading Abolitionist, to individuals in different sections of the country:

(From the Charlottesville Jeffersonian.)

"HARRISON'S FORGETFULNESS."

"One of the most conclusive evidences of the 'decline and fall' of General Harrison's mental powers, is the very remarkable 'forgetfulness,' which he has frequently manifested, in relation to some of the most important events of his own life. History, itself, has frequently suffered from his want of memory; inasmuch that some of the most important events of the late war, though the accounts of them were published under the immediate supervision of the General, have been utterly falsified, and made to appear in any other than their proper colors. But his 'forgetfulness' has manifested itself most surprisingly, in relation to the subject of Abolition. In 1822, for instance, he recollected perfectly well, and so stated in his 'address to the public,' published at that time, that he 'was a member of an Abolition Society in Richmond at the age of eighteen,' and his memory seems to have continued pretty clear, as to this fact, as late as the spring of 1840; for he felt no difficulty in stating to Doctor Henry, of Illinois, and Mr. Evans of Maine, last spring, that he was a member of the society alluded to in his 'address to the public,' and that it was an 'abolition' society. After that time, however, his 'forgetfulness' rapidly grew upon him, and by June last, the light of other days seem to have totally 'faded' from his memory. In his letter to his 'cousin' at Richmond, James Lyons, Esq., he cannot even so much as remember that he had even used the word 'Abolition,' much less that he was ever a member of an Abolition society. But his memory, all at once, gets particularly clear again; for he recollects positively, that the society at Richmond of which he was a member, was not an abolition, but a 'humane' society!!! Wonderful accuracy!!!! Amazing stretch of memory!!!!—In his 'address to the public,' in 1822, he does not recollect that it was a 'humane' society,—and in his letters to Henry and Evans he 'forgets' (save the mark!) the word 'humane' and substitutes, in its place, 'Abolition.' But in his letter to 'cousin Jemmy Lyons' he can 'hardly believe' that he had even used the word 'Abolition,' and remembers, perfectly, that 'humane' was 'known to be the one by which the society was really distinguished!' Yes! after the lapse of forty long years—after having written letter after letter, in relation to this same society, in all of which he calls it an Abolition society—he all at once in his letter to Lyons, remembers, for the FIRST time, that it 'really' was a 'humane' society.

"Now, how are we to account for these wonderful 'aberrations' in the memory of Gen. Harrison? The most charitable construction would be to suppose that his memory, like the last flickering of a taper, has suddenly blazed out with an unnatural brilliancy, just before its final extinguishment. If this is not true, then the more disgraceful charge must fasten upon him of having, in his address to the public, and in his letters to Henry and Evans, wilfully and deliberately perverted the truth, by stating that to be an 'Abolition' society, which he 'knew' not to be such—for he says, in the

letter to Lyons, that 'humane was known to be the word by which the society was really distinguished.'—In other words, he must have 'FORGOTTEN the TRUTH, and REMEMBERED what was NOT TRUE!' Fortunately for the cause of truth, however, the Constitution of the society has been discovered, and it turns out to have been 'really' an ABOLITION society. It was called a 'society for PROMOTING THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY, and the relief of free negroes, or others, unlawfully held in bondage, and other humane purposes.'—So that the first and most prominent object of the society was the 'promoting the abolition of slavery.' After this, who can place any confidence in the memory of the Federal candidate for the Presidency?

"It will be seen from the constitution of the society of which Harrison was a member, which we publish below, that he (H.) went as far in support of Abolition, as the most rabid of the school of Arthur Tappan could wish.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE VIRGINIA SOCIETY, For promoting the Abolition of Slavery and the relief of Free Negroes, or others, unlawfully held in bondage, and other humane purposes.

"From a full belief that 'the Lord's mercy is over all his works,' that he created mankind of every nation, language, and color, equally free, and that slavery in all its forms, in all its degrees, is an outrageous violation, and an odious degradation of human nature—that it is inconsistent with the precepts of the Gospel, of 'doing to others as we would they should do unto us'; and that it is not only a moral, but a political evil, which tends, wherever it prevails, to deprave the morals of the people, weaken the bands of society, discourage trades and manufactures, and rather promotes arbitrary power than secures the just rights and liberties of mankind: Believing also, that the societies already established in other parts of the world, for promoting the abolition of slavery and the slave trade, have been of real advantage in manifesting the unrighteous policy of the one, and the iniquity of the other—WE, THE SUBSCRIBERS, in humble hope of contributing our mite to the cause of humanity and the promotion of righteousness in the earth, have associated ourselves, under the title of 'THE VIRGINIA SOCIETY, for promoting the abolition of Slavery and the relief of free Negroes, or others, unlawfully held in bondage, and other humane purposes.'

"For effecting these purposes, the following Constitution is adopted:

"ARTICLE I. The officers of the society shall consist of a President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, nine acting committee-men, and two corresponding members, in the limits of each district court, all of whom, excepting the acting committee, shall be annually chosen by ballot.

"II. The President, or, in his absence, the Vice President, shall preside in all meetings, and subscribe all the public acts of the society, who, moreover, shall have the power to call a special meeting of the society, whenever he shall judge it necessary, or when any six members of the acting committee shall concur in requiring it.

"III. The Secretary shall keep fair records of the proceedings of the society, and shall cause to be published from time to time, such proceedings or resolutions as the society may order, or the president with the acting committee may direct.

"IV. The Treasurer shall receive all donations, moneys, or securities, belonging to the society, and shall pay all orders signed by the President or Vice President, which orders shall be his vouchers for expenditures. He shall, before he enters on his office give bond for the faithful discharge of his duty, for two hundred pounds, or such large sum as the President and acting committee shall from time to time think right.

"V. If the President, Vice President, Secretary or Treasurer, be absent at any of the meetings, the society may elect others to act *pro tempore*, or should any of the officers above named resign or be displaced, the society shall fill the vacancy in the mode prescribed by the first article.

"VI. The acting committee shall transact such business as shall occur in the recess of the society, and report the same at each half yearly meeting. They shall have a right, with the concurrence of the President and V. President, to draw upon the Treasurer for such sums of money as shall be necessary to carry on the business of their appointment. They shall also act as an elect-

ing committee, and their approbation in writing shall be an admission to such persons as shall sign the constitution of the society; five of whom shall be a quorum. After their first election, at each succeeding yearly meeting, three of their number shall be relieved from duty, three others shall be elected to succeed them.

"VII. In all cases where persons legally entitled to freedom shall be held in bondage, it shall be the business of the corresponding members, appointed in the different Districts, more particularly to inquire into and give notice to the acting committee of all such cases, and to procure authenticated copies from records, or such other writings on testimonies as they may think necessary or proper for investigation of the right and relief of the sufferers.

"VIII. Every person, previous to his admission as a member, shall subscribe the constitution of the society, and contribute not less than \$1 on admittance, and half a dollar at each succeeding half-yearly meeting towards defraying the contingent expenses. If he neglects to pay the same for more than two years, he shall, upon due notice being given him of his delinquency, cease to be a member: But foreigners, or persons not residing in this State, may be elected corresponding members, without being subject to any payment, and shall be admitted to the meetings of the society, during their residence in this State.

"IX. Two-thirds of the members present at a half yearly meeting shall have the power to expel any person whom they may deem unworthy of remaining a member—and no person shall be a member who holds a slave, or is concerned in the unrighteous traffic of buying or selling that unhappy race of human beings.

"X. Twelve members, with the President or Vice President, constitutionally assembled, shall be a quorum of the society for transacting business.

"XI. The society shall meet on the second day, called Monday, in the months called October and April, at such place or places as may be from time to time agreed on.

"XII. No law or regulations of the society shall contradict any part of the constitution, nor shall any alteration in the constitution be made, without being proposed at a previous meeting. All questions shall be decided by a majority of votes; and in case of an equal division, the presiding officer to have the casting vote.

The present officers of the society are,

ROBT PLEASANTS, President,

JOHN FINNEY, Vice President,

JAMES SMITH, Secretary.

JAMES LADD, Treasurer.

Acting Committee.

JOHN CREW,

THOMAS PLEASANTS,

JAMES HARRIS,

GEORGE JONES,

HENRY FEATHERSTONE,

MICAH CREW,

JOHN HONEYCUT,

RICHARD GRAVES,

GRESHAM DAVIS.

*When the constitution was originally published.

Can any rational man doubt, after reading the above that Harrison is an Abolitionist 'died in the wool?' He tells us in his celebrated 'address to the public' in 1822, that he had 'fulfilled the obligations he came under,' when he joined the society in Richmond! What those obligations were, no man can doubt after reading the constitution.

Let it be remembered, in connection with this subject, that HARRISON COULD NOT, WHEN RESIDING IN VIRGINIA, HAVE BEEN A JUROR IN ANY CASE, 'WHEREIN THE PROPERTY OF A PERSON, HELD AS A SLAVE, DEMANDING FREEDOM, SHOULD COME BEFORE A COURT FOR TRIAL!' So suspicious were the designs of this Richmond society, of which he was a member, that the Legislature of Virginia actually passed a law prohibiting any member of that society from serving on such juries. It would seem from this that the Legislature of the State did not regard Harrison as 'sound on the subject of Abolition.' If any doubt it, we will give the law which, there is every reason to believe, was aimed directly at the Richmond abolition, or as Harrison now remembers, 'humane society.' Here is the law.

"An act reducing into one, all acts and parts of acts, providing a method to help and speed poor persons in their suits.

"(Passed January 17th, 1818) I. Rev. Code, vol. 1 p. 484.

"Sec. 7. 'In all cases wherein the property of a person held as a slave, demanding freedom, shall come before a court for trial, no person, who shall be proved

to be a member of any society instituted for the purpose of EMANCIPATING NEGROES from the possession of their masters, shall be permitted to serve as a juror, in the trial of said cause.

This law was passed first in 1797, and may be found in the editions of 1803 and 1814, chap. 222—Sec. 3, as well as in the Revised Code of 1819.

We now submit it to the people of Virginia to know whether they are willing to trust a man, as president whom the Legislature of the State refused to trust as a juror?

To show the different phases, which Gen. H. has assumed on this subject, we subjoin the following summary from the Globe:

"Gen. Harrison's *Fervency*.—In the month of January, 1840, Gen. Harrison tells Mr. Evans that he belonged to an Abolition society when only 18 years of age.

"In February, he tells Governor Owen that he had never belonged to any such society.

"In March, he tells the editor of the Philanthropist repeatedly, that he had belonged to an Abolition society.

"On the 10th April, nothing can induce him to answer any interrogatories about it, coming from friends or foes!

"On the 17th April, he answers the interrogatories of his friends at Springfield, Illinois, repeating, no doubt, the same story of his belonging to an Abolition society.

"And on the 1st June, in his letter to Mr. Lyons, he can 'hardly believe' that he has ever used the term Abolition society at all to designate the association to which he belonged!

"Could the most drunken lover of hard cider be guilty of more gross perjury?"

"In his letter to Mr. Evans, the General says, *don't publish it*.

"In his letter to Mr. Henry, he says, *don't publish it*.

"In his letter to Mr. Lyons, he says, *don't publish it*.

"And his 'Confidential Committee,' say, in their Oswego letter, Feb. 20th, 1840, the policy of the committee is—

"That the General make no further declaration of his principles FOR THE PUBLIC EYE, whilst occupying his present position."

"To this policy the General has strictly adhered in all his letters since written, as far as any knowledge of them has come to the public. They have all been written only for the private eye.

"Why was this 'POLICY' adopted? The reason is palpable. It was to MAKE FALSEHOOD EFFECTIVE by circulating it in private, and avoid the consequence of such an exposure as we now make!"

(From the New York Standard, September 28.)

MR. BUTLER AND MR. WEBSTER.

We present to our readers to-day, Mr. Butler's speech at Tammany Hall on the 24th inst., and invite for it a calm and attentive perusal by men of all parties. To us it seems the most perfect exposition and defence of Jeffersonian Democracy that we have met, and to exhibit a perfect contrast to that Democracy which is professed and acted upon by Mr. Webster and his party, except on those occasions when it suits their policy to profess themselves to be Democrats of the Jeffersonian school. One of these occasions presented itself at Patchogue, Suffolk county, a county so famous for its glorious adherence to the doctrines of Mr. Jefferson, that not even Mr. Webster dare, in any nook of Suffolk, openly oppose the principles of that great Apostle of Liberty.

Repudiating, for himself, the known and avowed principles of his party, he claims for them and for himself to be and to have been, the only true disciples, and denies that Mr. Van Buren and those who support him are of the Jeffersonian school. He challenges to an argument on this point, and Mr. Butler not only meets him, but utterly demolishes his pretensions by an *ad hominem* reference to the recorded speeches of this Whig Goliath, or, to use the language of Mr. Butler, he has hurled a stone from his sling which has brought the giant to the earth.

This speech of Mr. Butler will be an imperishable monument to his fame, and one of the great landmarks to which the free people of this Republic will point, in all time to come, as that which separates the ample ground occupied by Democrats, who claim to live under a Government founded on personal rights, rather than a property qualification in its electors from the narrow, selfish, aristocratical domain of the pseudo Whigs. We have never before seen the dividing line of the two great parties which were formed at the close of the Revolution, so distinctly marked, nor the noble and immortal doctrines of our party so ably expounded and defended.

MR. BUTLER'S SPEECH

At the Democratic Meeting held at Tammany Hall, on the 24th instant, to respond to the Nominations at Syracuse.

MR. BUTLER, on coming forward in compliance with the call of the meeting, was received with loud and long-continued cheers, and after silence had been restored, briefly returned his thanks to the audience, for the warm-hearted reception they had given him; and having informed them that he was authorized by Mr. Wright to promise his attendance so soon as he should be relieved from the meeting at Brooklyn, took occasion to pay "a passing tribute to friendship and to justice," in reference to that able statesman and consistent Democrat.

Mr. B. then referred to the particular object of the meeting, and spoke, at some length, of the Democratic candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor, recently nominated at Syracuse. With Col. Bouck he had been personally acquainted for nearly twenty-five years, and could testify to his sound and unwavering political principles, and his fitness for the office for which he had been nominated. He particularly noticed the fact that,

during the long period he held the office of Canal Commissioner, not a dollar of the immense sums of public money entrusted to his care had failed to reach its proper destination; nor had he ever been involved in controversies or difficulties with contractors, although it was universally conceded that no man could be more faithful in protecting the interests of the State. The integrity and practical good sense, implied in this fact, was a sufficient guaranty that, in his hands, the interests and character of the State will be entirely safe.—Mr. Dickinson was equally deserving the confidence of the Democracy; and his able support of the rights of the city, in opposition to the Registry Law imposed upon us during the last session, should secure to him here a grateful and ardent support.

Mr. Butler was repeatedly cheered whilst speaking of Mr. Wright, and Messrs. Bouck and Dickinson and after closing his references to them, proceeded to speak as follows:

But, fellow-citizens, there are other considerations connected with the approaching election, infinitely more important than the success of this man or that—considerations, in comparison with which, individuals sink into insignificance, except in so far as they are the exponents and representatives of principles, and the agents to carry out, if elected, the principles with which they are identified. The candidates for Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, and the candidates for the higher offices of President and Vice President of the United States, to whose support we are pledged, are, as we believe, representatives of the greatest and most salutary principles, the vindication and establishment of which depend upon the result of the pending contest. Let me illustrate this position.

Parties, in all time, have been found in free governments; their existence is one of the prices which man must pay for the boon of freedom. When their object is, merely to keep or to get office, for the sake of its emoluments and honors, their disputes are of little moment, and the success or defeat of any particular party, is only important to the public as its candidates are more or less qualified for the public service. But when parties divide on great questions of public policy; when their differences are radical; when the objects and measures they have in view are such as deeply and widely to affect the liberty of the citizen and the welfare of the State; then their conflicts become vastly important; and then the business of politics becomes the highest of all merely earthly concerns.

Of his latter description, fellow-citizens, is the great contest now going on in the United States—eminently so, for in the interests which gave it birth, the points on which it turns, and the issues it involves, we have all the elements of that old and interminable conflict, which, in every free State, has divided the people into two general parties—the one popular, or Democratic in its character, the other directly the reverse. The distinctive features of each party may be described in few words: the one regards the elevation of man in his intellectual and immortal part, and not the acquisition of wealth or the exercise of power, as the highest end of the social state; and it regards government as a mere trust, delegated by all the people, to their agents, to be exercised impartially and faithfully, for the benefit of all and of each—and this, I need not tell you, is a popular or Democratic party. The other deems the protection of property—which it regards as the fountain of individual comfort and of national prosperity—the chief interest of society; and is continually seeking to confine the sovereignty, in effect, if not in form, to some select class—some privileged order of the people—and to make Government subsidiary, not to the interests of the mass, but to those of the few; and this, you perfectly understand, is an anti-Democratic, an aristocratic party.

So long as human nature shall continue what it has been and is—so long as ambition and avarice, the love of power and the love of money, shall dwell in man's bosom, these parties will ever exist in greater or less activity; and, under the blinding influences of those passions, many, very many, will adopt the views, and promote the interests of the aristocratic party, under the sincere conviction that the condition of each member of society will really be better when the power is vested in the hands of a select class, than when it is shared among the whole community. Forms of Government, and local and other circumstances, may very much modify these distinctive features; but in spirit and tendency, they will be found to characterize the popular and anti-popular—the Democratic and Aristocratic parties, in all countries in which they exist. In the U. S., two parties of this opposite character were partially disclosed soon after the establishment of the Federal Constitution; but it was not until the struggle which brought into the Presidency that apostle of Democratic truth, Thomas Jefferson, that they were fully exhibited among us.

It was the conviction of Mr. Jefferson and his associates, that the Federal Government, as then administered, was gradually enlarging its powers by construction—that it was silently encroaching on the reserved rights of the States—and that it was fast tending, through the

instrumentality of its patronage and power, and especially by means of the Funding System and the Bank of the United States, to impair the free spirit of the people, to foster aristocratical distinctions, and ultimately to assimilate our institutions to the British model—which, it was well known, was held in high esteem by many leaders of the party—that led them to band together, for the purpose of overthrowing that administration, and bringing back the Government to the Republican tack. They were not willing that this Government, the fruit of so much toil and of so many dangers, should be converted into a job, for the benefit of fundholders and dealers in bank stock; they were not willing to see the States stripped of their rights to swell the power of the Union; they were not willing to stand in silence and with folded arms, whilst the Federal Legislature were enacting anti-Republican and unconstitutional laws, at the instance or with the assent of the Executive; and they resolved to do what they could to make this Government what its fathers designed it should be—a glorious Temple of Liberty—glorious in the amplitude and simplicity of its proportions, rather than its outward splendor or its internal decorations—through whose open doors the oppressed of every clime might freely enter—and at whose altar every American citizen, of whatsoever name, or creed, or condition, might stand in the full consciousness of equal right, and worship with his fellows. [Immense cheering.]

They triumphed; and the first act of their illustrious leader was to proclaim, in his inaugural address, for the instruction and safety of his countrymen, and for his own guidance, and that of his successors, the great principles of Democratic Liberty as applicable to our Government and to mark out, for the like purpose, the course to be pursued in its administration. The Democracy of 1801, received this invaluable paper, as the patriots of 1776, received from the same pen, the Declaration of Independence. It may well claim the same rank in our estimation, for each is perfect in its kind.

—So long as we and our posterity shall adhere to the instructions of the Inaugural Address, we may be sure that the great ends of the Revolution will be attained; that American liberty will be safe, American independence complete. So often as those instructions are departed from, the public interest will suffer; if the time shall ever come when they are wholly neglected, our liberties will be gone, and if the Union shall continue to exist, it will be because held together, not by fraternal compact, but by the arm of power upheld by military force. Cherish, then, fellow-citizens, the principles of this Address; make it the touchstone by which to try the merits of the candidates before you; rely not on vague promises or indefinite expectations; but see to it that the man you support for the Chief Magistracy of the Union is able to abide the faithful application of this unerring test to his acts and principles.

Fellow-citizens: I had supposed that if any two propositions of a political nature were plainer and more capable of easy and conclusive demonstration, than almost any other, they were these—first, that of the two great parties now striving for the mastery, there was but one which could, with any shadow of propriety, be said to stand upon the principles, and to support the policy of Thomas Jefferson; and that one, I had supposed to be, as you too have doubtless done, the party which styles itself Democratic, but which commonly receive from its well bred opponents the name of *Locofoco*—the party which favors the re-election of MARTIN VAN BUREN; and secondly, that if there has existed, at any time since 1801, a party which by way of eminence, may be regarded as peculiarly anti-Jeffersonian, it has so existed and is now to found in the self-styled Whig party of the present day. It seems, however, that the truth of these opinions is denied by our opponents; and that they intend not only to change the Administration, but to change the clearest and best established facts; to make black white and white black; and to prove that two and two do not make four, but actually make some other number.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, apply to these conflicting pretensions the test of Mr. Jefferson's Inaugural Address, and of the opinions subsequently expressed by him; and let us see how the contending parties will abide the trial.—A strict construction of the Federal Constitution, and therefore uncompromising hostility to a United States Bank; economy and simplicity, and therefore determined opposition to a needless National Debt; abstinence in the use of even admitted powers, and much more of doubtful ones, which are calculated to bring the patronage of the Federal Government into dangerous contact with the people, and therefore no splendid schemes of Internal Improvements; equal and exact justice to all men, and therefore no privileges to a particular class, in the shape of high Tariffs, or otherwise; sacred regard to the rights of the States, and therefore no interference with their domestic institutions by the Federal Government; undoubting faith in the capacity of man for self-government, and therefore plain and distinct appeals to his reason and judgment; equality of natural right and unlimited freedom of judgment, and therefore no attempt to coerce even the humblest to abandon their

rights; the will of the majority the vital law of the Republic, and therefore that will to be cheerfully acquiesced in. These are some of the more prominent principles, with their practical application, proclaimed and carried out by Thomas Jefferson; and which all, all who take him as a Mentor, must acknowledge as Democratic. Now, which of the two parties conforms to its policy, its mode of discussion, its tactics, to these principles? Which party is it that is pledged to oppose a National Bank and in execution of this policy has established an antagonist system; that is pledged to oppose, in every form, an assumption of the State debts; to oppose every scheme of Internal Improvement not clearly national; to oppose protective Tariffs; and to oppose Abolitionism? Is it the Whig party?—[Cries of no, no.] To ask the question is indeed to answer it in the negative. That party, though it has made no formal declaration of its principles, is led by those who have long and openly advocated, and who still advocate, a Bank of the United States; and the whole party oppose and denounce the Independent Treasury—the antagonistic measure—as unnecessary and destructive; and make hostility to that measure their chief battle-ery and rallying point. Their leaders were also identified with the high Tariff and Internal Improvement policy of the so-called American system; and they still hold the latitudinarian principles of construction on which that policy was built. They have given very clear evidence of a desire, either directly, or by means of the public lands, to take upon the Federal Government the enormous debts of the States. To that party, too, Abolitionism naturally allies itself; in several States the alliance is open and active; and there is every reason to believe, that the position of its candidate, in respect to the Abolitionists, was one of the circumstances that contributed to his selection.

What party, on the other hand, is openly committed by the declarations and pledges of its candidate, and in a hundred other ways, to the Jeffersonian principles just enumerated? Whatever epithets our opponents may bestow on us, whatever name they may attempt to take to themselves, they cannot rob us of our principles: they cannot unmake the indisputable fact, that the party which approves the measures and advocates the re-election of Martin Van Buren, is the only party with which the principles of Jefferson find favor, or by which they are or can be maintained.

But apply another test. Which of the two parties makes its appeal to the reason and judgment of the public; and which to their imaginations, their passions and their appetites? Which treats them as capable of self-government, and which as a senseless herd? Which leaves the operatives and other laborers in its employ free to vote according to their judgment and conscience; and which uses its power, in these and the like cases, to compel freemen to barter their birthright for a mess of pottage? Which submits to the decisions of the people, when fully expressed and constitutionally made through the ballot-box; and which resorts to contrivance and fraud, to panic and pressure, to acts of violence and to threats of revolution, to defeat the popular will? The answers to these questions will infallibly tell which is the popular, the Democratic, the Jeffersonian party, and which the opposite of all; and when applied to the two parties, they as infallibly point to the Whig party from its organization under that name in 1834, through its whole history to the present day, as possessing every mark of the anti-Democratic, the anti-Jeffersonian party. Mr. Butler illustrated this point, by a reference to the crisis of 1834; the distress meetings; the inflammatory speeches; the threats and acts of violence; the revolution "bloodless as yet" of Mr. Clay; the Sunday speeches; in the streets of Baltimore, &c., &c., with some anecdotes, very graphically told, illustrating the firmness of Andrew Jackson, during that remarkable era, all which was received with great applause, and frequently interrupted by loud and reiterated cheers. He also adverted to the mummery of log cabins, hard cider, coon skins, Tippecanoe songs, &c., &c., as evincing in the leaders of the Whig party, a settled contempt for the intelligence and virtue of the people; as involving a denial of their capacity for self-government; and as deeply injurious to the morals and character of the people; and he contended that such a party, especially when rallied under the standard of a candidate who refuses to declare himself, explicitly, on the great questions before the people, had not the slightest pretension to the name of Jeffersonian, but was in all respect thoroughly imbued with the worst doctrines of the old Federal party, which was put down by the elevation of Mr. Jefferson. He then proceeded as follows:

This claim to be regarded as the true successors of the Democracy of 1800, has recently been made by the modern Whig party, in every quarter of the Union; we may see it in the titles of their newspapers—in the calls and proceedings of their public meetings—in the handbills which are placarded on our walls—and in a variety of other forms. One of the most singular and imposing of the modes recently adopted, to give it cur-

rency, and especially with the Democratic people of New York, is the speech of a distinguished Senator from the State of Massachusetts delivered only two days ago, at a Whig gathering at Patchogue, in old Suffolk, time out of mind one of the most decided and consistent of the Democratic counties of this State.—Having myself, in connection with Mr. Wright and others, addressed a meeting of the Democracy at the same place, the day after Mr. Webster, I had occasion to hear something of his speech; and on my return to-day I found a part of it published in the Commercial Advertiser of last evening—one of the oldest and most reputable of our ancient Federal journals—which affirms it to have been copied from "THE DEMOCRATIC PRESS." What was told me at Patchogue is fully confirmed by this report so far as it goes. It contains much to amuse and to amaze—and in short, to use an expression of Mr. Webster's, is in every sense of the words, a "most extraordinary" speech; and this, whether we consider the speaker or the place, the language or the auditory. Its general drift, aside from the praises which the orator bestows upon himself, is to show that Mr. Van Buren's principles and policy are not Democratic; that they do not follow in the track of Mr. Jefferson; that they are not such as he would have supported, not "such as Virginia, the pure, old school of Democracy, would have supported;" and therefore not such as the Democracy of Suffolk county—the descendants of "the L'Honnored, the Floyds, and the Smiths, and the Joneses"—should support. In order to give greater emphasis and effect to his appeal "to the intelligence" of Suffolk, Mr. Webster exhibits himself as a real Simon Pure—an out and out Democrat—and as he felt quite certain that the assumption of this character would be very apt to lead to historical reminiscences, and that in the course of them it would be charged that he was not only no Democrat, but the very reverse—an aristocrat—he lashes himself into a towering passion, and stoutly affirms, not only that he is not, and never has been, an aristocrat, but that the man who says he is, is a LIAR, and the man who will not meet him fairly with argument, and who uses idle and abusive declamation instead, and then will not come within the reach of his arm, is not only a LIAR, but a COWARD! In view of language like this, we may, truly say, with Mr. Webster, that "the times are extraordinary;" that they are indeed "most extraordinary." For it is no vulgar demagogue—no brawler from the kennels—that employs this language; it is DANIEL WEBSTER, of Boston, distinguished at the bar, thrice distinguished in the Senate; the educated, accomplished, refined Mr. Webster—the orator and the Statesman—the great "Expounder of the Constitution"—the "Godlike man!" And he utters it, not in the heat of debate; not when goaded by an insolent antagonist; but when addressing his "friends;" when surrounded by his admirers; in the presence, too, of the gentler sex, whom his fame had drawn to the assemblage; and as part of a "plain speech to the intelligence of the county" of Suffolk, in the State of New York. [Cheers.]

This is not the first occasion on which Mr. Webster has characterized the times as "extraordinary." I remember that, in the spring of 1834, he thought them even more "extraordinary" than they now are: for, in reference to certain exhibitions in the streets of Baltimore, in which he figured, and to which I have already alluded, he repeated, in his place in the Senate, a declaration that had been made to him, implying that the times were revolutionary, and that the Sabbath had been blotted out. Both those implications, however, were erroneous; much as it was desired by the Whig leaders, the revolution did not come; and to the great joy of the religious community of all denominations, the Sabbath still remained. It had been desecrated, it is true, but it still remained to bring to man and beast their appointed rest—to gladden the face of childhood—to recruit the powers which labor had exhausted—and to instruct and elevate all classes of the people. [Cheers.] Still, no doubt Mr. Webster really believed that, unless the moneys of the people were restored to the coffers of the bank, a revolution would ensue; just as he now thinks that the "extraordinary efforts making all over the country to effect a change in the Government," will accomplish that result. In the bitter disappointment of his high-raised hopes and his frantic predictions in 1834, we may find an augury of a like catastrophe to await him now. [Cheers.]

Fellow-citizens, I shall leave it to you to form your own judgment on the propriety and good taste of this exhibition of Mr. Webster; and shall now proceed to charge and to prove that he is, in what I conceive to be the appropriate and just sense of the word, an Aristocrat. To prevent misunderstanding, let me clearly define what I mean by the expression.

I do not mean to say that Mr. Webster, in his personal appearance or bearing, his intercourse, manners, or his domestic appointments, is liable to this charge.—In dress and manners I know him to be simple and unostentatious. I have never been within his dwelling, and if I had, the example of Charles Ogle would not be imitated by me. But plainness and simplicity

of manners and domestic arrangements, are no proof that a man is not an Aristocrat. In England where the Aristocratic spirit exists in its greatest power, the nobility of the highest class are said to be exceedingly plain in their dress, simple in their manners, and often simple in their general habits. Even there, the question whether a public man is an Aristocrat, or not, must be chiefly, if not exclusively determined by the system of Government—the course of policy—to which he gives his influence and support.—In our country this is peculiarly the case, because our fundamental laws have forbidden titles of nobility, and have secured to us Republican forms of Government. What I mean then by calling Mr. Webster an Aristocrat, is, that as a public man he has advocated and maintained principles of legislation and of Government, which, in their tendency in some cases, and by their direct operation in others, were decidedly Aristocratic. I shall undertake to prove this by the kind of evidence he has himself indicated—a reference to his public acts. In making this charge, and in entering upon its proof, I am fully aware of the task I have assumed. The Goliath who thus arrogantly defies the hosts of his opponents is very much my superior in intellectual ability, as well as in size and stature; but perhaps it may happen now, as it did of old, that the stripling with his sling may bring the boaster to the earth. If not greatly deceived, I have in it a stone furnished by himself, which will achieve this result. But before I resort to it, let me employ a few other proofs which may perhaps be sufficient for my purpose.

I remark, then, that Mr. Webster, during the long period of his service in the Congress of the U. S., has generally given to measures of an Aristocratic tendency his warm and decided support. The Bank of the U. S., Internal Improvements, and since the capital of Boston has been invested in manufactures, a protective Tariff, have been defended and sustained by his voice and by his votes. I am one of those who think that these measures, and especially a National Bank, have an Aristocratic tendency; that they are calculated to give advantages and benefits of a pecuniary kind, to particular classes, to the exclusion of the rest of the people—to increase the inequality of wealth in our community—to make the rich richer and the poor poorer—and to give, in many cases, to the few, a command over the labor and the minds of the many; and, thus thinking, I hold that he who deliberately and systematically gives his support to these systems of policy is, so far as an American legislator can be, an aristocrat. I know not how, otherwise, a member of Congress can make himself by his votes obnoxious to the charge.

The proof, if left here, would be abundantly satisfactory to those who think with me, in relation to these laws. But Mr. Webster will doubtless demur to our view of them; and I shall therefore bring forward the more decisive evidence to which I alluded. It consists of Mr. Webster's views, delivered in the Convention of Massachusetts, held for the amendment of the Constitution of that State, in 1821 as to the proper basis and measure of political power. You will find that he deliberately defended and maintained, with precision and distinctness, in reference to the Constitution of the Senate of that State, the aristocratic principle, in preference to the democratic.

To enable you to see this, I must first state the manner in which the question arose.

The Constitution of Massachusetts, adopted in 1780, divides the Legislature into two branches, the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Senate consists of forty members, to be chosen by districts into which the Legislature are to divide the State. In apportioning the Senators, the Constitution provides that the General Court or Legislature "shall govern themselves by the proportion of the public taxes paid by the said districts." In other words, the Senators, instead of being apportioned among the districts in proportion to the population of the districts respectively, (as is the case in New York and in almost all the other States of the Union,) are to be apportioned among them, according to the property within them, that being the effect of the reference to the tax list contained in the Constitution. The House of Representatives are, by the same Constitution, apportioned on the principle of equality, by a scale of peculiar arrangement, according to the number of rateable polls—in other words, according to the population of the respective towns. The principle of apportioning representation according to population is obviously the Democratic one. It obtained in most of the Constitutions formed prior to 1801; it has been adopted, I believe, in respect to both branches of the Legislature, in the Constitution of every State admitted into the Union since that epoch. On the other hand, it is equally plain, that the apportionment of the members of the Legislature, or of either branch of it, according to property instead of numbers is an aristocratic arrangement. Its effect is, to give to a select class or privileged order—the holders of taxable property—a larger share of the power of Government, so far as that body is concerned, than is given to the same number of citi-

zens who may be destitute of property; and to give to a wealthy county a larger share of the sovereign power than is given to a less opulent one. The case is thus brought within the definition of an aristocracy, as explained by all the writers on political science.—For an aristocracy is that form of Government in which the sovereign power is lodged, not in one man, which is a *monarchy*—nor in the whole people, which is a *democracy*—but in a *select class or order*, no matter how ascertained, or by what name they may be called.

The practical effect of the provision referred to may be illustrated by supposing the county of Suffolk, which includes the city of Boston, to contain one *tenth* of the population, and one *fifth* of the taxable property of the State; in this case, if the forty Senators were apportioned according to *population*, Boston would be entitled to only *four*; if apportioned according to *property*, she would be entitled to *eight*. In other words, 80,000 inhabitants in Boston would have just twice as many Senators as 80,000 inhabitants in other parts of the State.

In the case I have supposed, I have taken even numbers to exhibit the working of the principle; and I have not had opportunity to ascertain the exact proportion. But if the same principle were adopted in this State, it would produce, when applied to the city of New York, the following result: Our city, at the last State Census, had less than one *eighth* of the population, and to make a Senate District with four Senators, Kings and Richmond were added. But in 1833, we had *four tenths* or nearly *one half* of the taxable property, which would give to this city, were the Senate apportioned according to *property*, *twelve* of the thirty-two. These illustrations are sufficient to show the Aristocratic nature, and the palpable injustice, according to *our* notions, whatever Bostonians may think of it, of the Massachusetts rule.

This part of the Constitution of Massachusetts is in exact accordance with the doctrines of John Adams, in regard to the proper mode of checking and balancing the different departments of the Government, as expounded in his defence of the American Constitution; in which, as is well known, he advocates very high-toned doctrines. In the Convention of 1821, a vigorous attempt was made by Messrs. Dearborn, Lincoln, Childs, and other members from the country, to get rid of this aristocratical provision. Mr. Dearborn moved to strike it out, and to substitute, in its stead, the Democratic principle of an apportionment according to population. This motion was opposed by the venerable John Adams, then in the Convention, in a short speech; and by Daniel Webster, then a resident of Boston, in an elaborate and powerful argument. The motion failed; the obnoxious provision was retained, and to this day it is a part of the Constitution of Massachusetts; for which the people of that State are mainly indebted to Daniel Webster. I shall now proceed to read to you some extracts, which will show you what sort of a Democrat Daniel Webster then was.

Mr. Webster thus states the question with his accustomed clearness:

"The immediate question now under discussion, is, in what manner shall the Senators be elected? They are to be chosen in districts; but shall they be chosen in proportion to the number of inhabitants in each district; or, in proportion to the taxable property of each district; or, in other words, in proportion to the part which each district bears in the public burdens of the State? The latter is the existing provision of the Constitution; and to this I give my support. The proposition of the honorable member from Roxbury (Mr. Dearborn) proposes to divide the State into certain legislative districts, and to choose a given number of Representatives in each district in proportion to the population."

He then refers to Messrs. Child of Pittsfield, and Lincoln of Worcester, who supported Mr. Dearborn's proposition, so far as regarded the choice of Senators, without explaining their views as to the choice of Representatives, and, after some comments, thus repeats his preference of the existing provision:

"It has been said, that the Constitution, as it now stands, gives more than an equal and proper number of Senators to the county of Suffolk. I hope I may be thought to contend for the general principle, without being influenced by any regard to its local application." "I wish to look only to the principle, and as I believe that to be sound and salutary, I give my vote in favor of maintaining it."

He then proceeds to argue in support of his opinion, and the general course of his argument is this—that to make the Senate an efficient check on the House of Representatives, there should be *some difference of origin, or character, or interest, of feeling, or sentiment* in the two bodies; and that the apportioning of the Senate according to the *property* of the different districts, as was done by the existing Constitution, was a just and useful mode of effecting the difference required. This, you perceive, is the very essence of the Aristocratical doctrine, as defended by John Adams in the work to which I referred.

I will now give you some extracts from the argument which Mr. Webster offered in support of his doctrine. "The gentleman from Roxbury" (says he) "called for authority on this subject. He asked, what writer of reputation had approved the principle for which we contend." After some remarks to show that, even if no authority could be cited, the principle should not be expunged, inasmuch as it had worked very well

—the standing argument of all the enemies of reform—he adds:

"But, sir, I take the principle to be well established, by writers of the greatest authority. In the first place, those who have treated of *natural law*, have maintained, as a principle of that law, that, as far as the object of society is the protection of something in which the members possess unequal shares, it is just, that the weight of each person in the common council should bear a relation and proportion to his interests. Such is the sentiment of Grotius, and he refers, in support of it, to several institutions among the ancient States."

Thus it seems that in 1821 Mr. Webster sought for precedents and authorities, not in Thomas Jefferson and the Democratic principles of the Declaration of Independence, or the Constitutions of the new States, framed after the triumph of 1800; but in the institutions of ancient times, in no one of which were the principles of Democratic liberty, as now understood in our country, at all carried out. He proceeds: "Those authors who have written more particularly on the subject of *political institutions* have many of them maintained similar sentiments." To this effect he quotes from Montesquieu, but soon leaves him to go to an author about a century older, for whom he seems to cherish peculiar reverence, and who, it appears, expresses his own sentiments more exactly:

"One of the most ingenious of political writers," says Mr. Webster, "is Mr. Harrington, an author not now read as much as he deserves."

Ah! now we shall have the very quintessence of political philosophy—that which the great expounder of the Constitution thinks peculiarly worthy of attention "now"—i. e. in 1821 and in the U. S. of America.—Let us hear what Mr. Harrington says, that "ingenious" writer, so much to the taste of Mr. Webster, and whose writings the American Democrats have so stupidly neglected. He goes on to tell us what it is:

"It is his leading object in his Oceana, to prove that power naturally and necessarily follows property. He maintains that a government founded on property is legitimately founded; and that a government founded on a disregard of property is founded in injustice, and can only be maintained by military force."

Here, fellow-citizens, you have the principle of Mr. Harrington, whose book Mr. Webster so highly approves, and what is it but rank aristocracy—the vesting of the sovereign power in a particular class, the holders of property? But hear a little more of Mr. Webster's quotation from Mr. Harrington:

"If one man," says he, i. e. Harrington, "be sole landholder, like the Grand Signior, his empire is absolute. If a few possess the land, this makes the Gothic or Feudal Constitution. If the whole people be landlords, then is it a Commonwealth."

That is, the sovereign power, according to Mr. Harrington and Mr. Webster, should be vested in the holders of land, to the exclusion of not only of the vast mass who own no property of any kind, but to the exclusion also of the owners of personal property, however large in amount; and this sovereignty is to be parcelled out among the landholders in proportion to the extent of their respective domains. So that a wealthy or fortunate proprietor who may acquire title to one of the wide prairies of the West, is to be lord or Grand Signior of the tract, though in process of time it should be filled with thousands of hardy yeomen, unless the Grand Signior were willing to part with his power by selling out the fee. But hear Mr. Webster a little further:

"It is strange," says Mr. Pope, in one of his recorded conversations, "that Harrington should be the first man to find out so evident and demonstrable a truth as that of property being the basis and measure of power."

But though Mr. Webster, in his zeal to support the authority of his favorite author, thus draws from the rich stores of his general reading, a passage from Mr. Pope, he proceeds to correct a mistake into which the great ethical poet had fallen, in respect to the originality of Harrington's views:

"In truth," (says Mr. Webster,) "Mr. H. was not the first. The idea is as old as political science itself. It may be found in Aristotle, Lord Bacon, Sir Walter Raleigh, and other writers. Harrington seems, however, to be the first writer who has illustrated and expanded the principle, and given to it the effect and prominence which justly belong to it. To this sentiment, sir, I entirely agree. It seems to me to be plain that, in the absence of military force, political power naturally and necessarily goes into the hands which hold the property."

Can anything, fellow-citizens, be more distinct, unambiguous, unequivocal than this? Mr. Webster not only defends the particular aristocratical provision contained in the Constitution of Massachusetts; but, in doing so, is at great pains to lay down, in the clearest and most positive terms, the general principle of aristocratical domination; to express his preference for it; and to vindicate it as the only true and legitimate basis of government. He draws his principles not from Thos. Jefferson, whom he now so much admires and reveres; not from the Declaration of Independence, which affirms it to be a self-evident truth, that *all men* are created equal, and that Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, (and the honest laborer, or mechanic, or merchant, is surely among the governed, even though he may not own a foot of land,) not from the various American Authors and institutions which vindicate this doctrine; but from the musty pages of Aristotle, and from the imperfect views of the early pioneers in the path of liberty, and especially Harrington, the least democratic of the class.

Fellow-citizens of all classes, fellow Democrats, fellow workingmen—for I too am a working man, and

have been so from boyhood—and, to labor, patient labor, in my calling—labor not more honorable or useful than yours, but I am sure equally, if not more severe—I am I indebted for whatever of substance or consideration I possess—I put it to you, if the doctrines thus advocated by Mr. Webster—doctrines which would deny to the intelligent merchant, or trader, or shipmaster—to the industrious mechanic—to the useful laborer in all the various departments of industry, their equal right to participate in the power of the Government, according to their numbers, because they do not own a farm in the country or a tenement in town, although they contribute by militia and jury service, and even by tax on personal property, to the support of Government, are not eminently Aristocratic; and whether the man who deliberately, studiously, laboriously defends such doctrines, is not, in the highest sense in which an American statesman can be, an Aristocrat? [Loud cries of he is, he is, from all parts of the room.]

There are several other passages, equally pertinent, and if possible even stronger than any I have read, which I will not now read, because I can no longer trespass in this way on your time; but I shall cause them to be incorporated in the report of what I am now saying, by which you will see that, while he occasionally utters a sound remark, he goes on to argue and reason, at great length, and with the solemnity of a deep and thorough conviction of the truth and justice of what he was maintaining, that the principle for which he contended was not only right in itself, but necessary to the promotion of social order; because that portion of the people who were not possessed of property were incapable of self-government, and unfit to share any portion of political power.

[The following are the further extracts referred to by Mr. Butler:]

"The freest Government, if it could exist, would not be long acceptable, if the tendency of the laws were to create a rapid accumulation of property in few hands, and to render the great mass of the population dependent and penniless. In such a case, the popular power must break in upon the rights of property, or else the influence of property must limit and control the exercise of popular power. Universal suffrage, for example, could not long exist in a community, where there was great inequality of property. The holders of estates would be obliged, in such case, either in some way to restrain the right of suffrage, or else such right of suffrage would, ere long, divide the property!"

"In the nature of things, those who have not property, and see their neighbors possess much more than they think they need, cannot be favorable to laws made for the protection of property. When this class becomes numerous it grows clamorous. It looks on property as its plunder, and is naturally ready at all times for violence and revolution. It would seem, then, to be the part of political wisdom to found government on property, and to establish such distribution of property by the laws which regulate its transmission and alienation, as to interest the great majority in the protection of the government. This is, I imagine, the true theory, the actual practice of our Republican institutions."

"If the nature of our institutions be to found Government on property, and that it should look to those who hold property for its protection, it is entirely just that property should have its due weight and consideration in political arrangements. Life and personal property are no doubt to be protected by law; but property is also to be protected by law; and is the fund out of which the means for protecting life and liberty are usually furnished. We have no experience that teaches us that any other rights are safe where property is not safe. Confiscation and plunder are generally in revolutionary commotions, not far before banishment, imprisonment and death. It would be monstrous to give even the name of Government to any association in which the rights of property should not be competently secured. The disastrous revolutions the world has witnessed—those political thunder storms and earthquakes which have overthrown the pillars of society, from their deepest foundations, have been revolutions against property."

"The English revolution of 1688 was a revolution in favor of property as well as of other rights. It was brought about by the men of property for their security; and our own immortal revolution was undertaken, not to share or plunder property, but to protect it. The acts of which the country complained were such as violated the rights of property."

Look at the Declaration of Independence, and its catalogue of grievances; mark how very few are violations of rights and property, how many are violations of personal and civil liberty, and of other rights beside those of property.

An immense majority of all those who had an interest in the soil were in favor of the Revolution; and they carried it through looking to its result for the security of their possessions. It was the property of the frugal yeomanry of New England, hard earned, but freely given, that enabled her to act her proper part, and perform her full duty, in achieving the independence of the country."

True; but how few, how very few, of the brave sons of New England, who flocked to Bunker's Hill, and who fought in other battle fields in every quarter of the Union were land-owners.

In another part of the speech, Mr. Webster to maintain the peculiar weight which he claims for property, argues that it is to property the people of Massachusetts are indebted for the great blessings of their common school system in the following words:

"What is it but the property of the rich devoted by law to the education of the poor, which has produced this state of things—[the general intelligence of Massachusetts?] Does any history show property more beneficially applied? Did any government ever subject the property of those who have estates to a burden more favorable to the poor or more useful to the whole community?"

"Sir, property, and the power which the law exercises over it, for the purpose of instruction, is the basis of the system. It is entitled to the respect and protection of government, because in a very vital respect it aids and sustains government."

"The honorable member from Worcester, in contending for the admission of the mere popular principle in all branches of the Go-

vernment, told us that our system rested on the intelligence of the community. He told us truly. But allow me, sir, to ask the honorable gentleman, what but *FOREFATHERS* supplies the means of that intelligence? What living fountain feeds this overflowing, ever-refreshing, ever-fertilizing stream of public instruction and general intelligence? If we take away from the towns the power of assessing taxes or property, will the school-houses remain open? If we deny to the poor the benefit which they now derive from the property of the rich, will their children remain on their farms, or will they not rather be in the streets in idleness and vice?"

He extends the same argument to the provisions which had existed in Massachusetts, for the maintenance of religious worship by taxation, and defends its propriety and usefulness.]

And now, fellow-citizens, have I not fulfilled my pledge? Have I not proved Mr. Webster by his votes and speeches in Congress, and above all in the Convention of Massachusetts, to be an aristocrat? [Cries of you have—you have.] Have I occupied your time or wasted my strength by mere declamation? True, I have spoken loud, because I wished you all to hear; I have spoken with fervor and animation, because I have deeply felt the interest of the subject; I have spoken distinctly and positively, because I had the proofs in my possession; I have argued with warmth and earnestness, because I wished to communicate to your minds the convictions of my own; but have I indulged in mere idle or abusive declamation? [Cries of no—no—you have proved him an aristocrat.]

Fellow-citizens, it has been no pleasant task to go through the exposition I have now made. It was far from my wish to make Mr. Webster the theme of so large a portion of my remarks; for whilst there is no reason why I should shun, when duty requires, the discussion of his conduct or opinions, I have no motive for seeking a personal controversy with him. As persons associated for several years in the government of the country, though in different departments, and as members of the same profession, we have frequently been brought together; and on my part, though differing from him in political sentiment, it has always given me pleasure to recognize his claims to personal courtesy and respect; whilst from him, I have, in like manner, received the same courtesy and respect.

During my residence at Washington he was more than once my welcome and honored guest; and we have never met since without taking each other by the hand. He has declared, in his recent speech, that the man who says he is an aristocrat, is a *liar*; and that the man who will not meet him fairly with argument, but uses idle and abusive declamation instead, and then will not come within the reach of his arm, is not only a *liar* but a *coward*. In the sense before defined, I have pronounced, and do again pronounce him, an aristocrat; and I feel that in doing so, I have not only not violated, but have spoken the truth. I have done more: I have proved him an aristocrat by record evidence, from which, with all his power of argument, I do not believe he can escape. Having the proofs in my memory, which, for good or for evil, is a tenacious and a ready one; understanding perfectly well their pertinency and conclusiveness, I could not, as one of the free citizens of this State, permit this gentleman to come into the midst of us and set up the bold pretension that he was a Democrat of the school of Jefferson, and in no sense a member of the opposite school—the school of aristocracy—without resolving, on the instant, to expose to public view the error and folly of that pretension. The unprecedented language he thought proper to employ, and the implied threat with which his assertion was concluded, only made me the more resolved to nail it, as a worthless coin, to the counter. After what has occurred, I shall not unnecessarily obtrude on the presence or the society of Mr. Webster; but without descending to imitate, as he has done, the language of the braggart, I think it right to say, that so often as official duty, or professional occupation, or the business or courtesies of life, shall make it proper to place myself "within the reach of his arm," most assuredly I shall do so. [Cheers long and loud.]

Fellow-citizens: In the pretensions now made by the Whig party and its leaders, to be the disciples of Thomas Jefferson, and the true exponents of the Democratic faith promulgated by him, there is involved a most impressive moral, to which, before I conclude, I must direct your attention. When the principles of that faith were first brought before the people—when, in opposition to the dogmas and the acts of the "Reign of Terror," they were made the rallying point of the Democracy of numbers—when they were established by the victory of 1800, as rules of policy—during the Democratic Administrations which succeeded—and until a very recent day—they were bitterly denounced by a great party, embracing most of the wealth and the educated talent of the country, as utterly unconstitutional, immoral, and destructive. During all this period every distinguished advocate of these principles, and above all, the man who gave them form and symmetry, and who first applied them to the Government of the country, was marked and singled out, for the determined opposition—the unsparing censure, of that party. What do we now see and hear?

The two parties into which the country is divided

acknowledge the truth of the Democratic creed; each claims for its own peculiar policy the merit of conformity to that creed; each inscribes on its banner the name of Jefferson; each demands to be regarded as the repository of his principles; and each rallies for a candidate who professes to take Jefferson as his Mentor.—Many of those who opposed him when in office, and who opposed his successor because he was the disciple of Thomas Jefferson, are now loudest in his praise; and, to complete the triumph of Jeffersonian Democracy, we have just seen that the ablest and most eminent of this class—one who was nurtured in the antagonistic school—who, as an orator and politician, made his debut in defence of the doctrines of ancient Federalism—who opposed the restrictive system of Jefferson and Madison—who opposed the declaration of war—who came into public life, a Federal member of Congress, elected, during the first year of the war, as its avowed and determined opponent—who from May, 1813, when he took his seat in Congress, to the peace of Ghent, was among the foremost in the ranks of opposition—who, at the session of September, 1814, could still remain a leader in those ranks, though the body of which he was a member had been driven from its hal by the torch of the enemy, and was surrounded, on every side, by traces of the invasion, the triumph, and the barbarism of that enemy—who could hold out, an active leader in those ranks, even after it was known that the British Government insisted on the cession of a large portion of our territory, now among the fairest regions of the West, as a *sine qua non*—the only condition of peace—who could hold out and hang back, though several of his associates, with the chivalrous Hanson at their head, nobly gave up their opposition, on the ground that the war had now assumed a new character, and that, to prevent a dismemberment of the Union, they would cheerfully vote to the men in power all needful supplies—who could hold out and hang back, a leader in opposition, whilst the Hartford Convention were plotting their treasonable plans, whilst the enemy was maturing his expedition against New Orleans, and up to the very last moment of the war—who long after this, avowed the Aristocratical doctrines of Government, which I have just laid before you, and whose whole public career, in the councils of the Union, has been signally hostile to the policy and wishes of Mr. Jefferson—gives the sanction of his high authority to the truth, the justice, the wisdom of the Democratic creed. [Immense cheering.] What an illustration have we in these changes of opinion—in these clamorous pretensions to discipleship in the school of Democracy—of the vitality, the omnipotence of Truth. In the language of one of our own number—one who to the fame of the true poet adds the equally high honor of a champion for Democratic liberty—

"Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies among his worshippers."

[Cries from all parts of the room, "three cheers for William C. Bryant,"—which were given with the greatest enthusiasm.]

Once more. In this universal adoption of the Democratic creed, and this anxiety to be regarded as the true successors of those who elected and sustained Mr. Jefferson, what a homage to him and to them! Who and what were they? From what class did they mainly come? From the well born or the wealthy—from those who deemed themselves the select, the wiser, the better, the higher classes? or from those who were sneered at by the self-constituted aristocracy of 1798, and of subsequent times, as the *poorer*, and *lower* classes? Fellow-citizens, they were just such men as you and I, and our associates of the present day—some merchants and professional men, and some of the wealthy and distinguished; but for the most part farmers, small traders, mechanics, artisans, seamen, fishermen, and day laborers of every grade and kind. Just such charges too were made against them and their candidate, as are made now, by our opponents. Just such opprobrious and scurrilous epithets were then heaped on them, as are now showered on the supporters of Van Buren. Locofocos, levellers, jacobins, destructives, agrarians, infidels, these are some of the choice epithets commonly bestowed upon us by the Whig presses and orators. Labored efforts are also made to persuade men of property, and the religious portions of the community, that the object of the party which supports Mr. Van Buren is, to overturn the foundations of social order; to deprive parents of the power of transmitting the fruits of their industry to their children; to divide estates among the Democracy of numbers; to destroy religious institutions; and in the room of everything valuable and sacred, to substitute the reign of vulgar violence and ruthless infidelity. A pamphlet called "The Crisis of the Country," written, as is said, by a clergyman, who assumes the name of Junius, has within a few weeks, been published and industriously circulated, for the very purpose of establishing these monstrous accusations. But what of all this? The same contemptuous epithets, and even in larger abundance, were poured upon the heads

of the true-hearted men who accomplished, by years of heroic effort, the civil revolution of 1800. The Federal press—and that was almost the whole press of the country—teemed with the most violent abuse; the irreligious and anti-social spirit of the worst periods of the French Revolution was imputed to Jefferson and his compatriots; the alarm cry of danger to order and religion was sounded from the pulpit. It was frequently charged, and doubtless many good men were made to believe, that if the Democracy triumphed, property would be wrested from its owners, churches be demolished, the Bible burnt, and the Sabbath be blotted out. Still, the honest and unterrified Democracy of that day nobly persevered. They were neither shaken by the assaults of their enemies, nor seduced by the appliances of wealth, nor overawed by the arm of power; they believed their principles to be sound, they knew their motives to be pure, and they trusted to Time—the great vindicator—to do justice to both. They triumphed; and though croakers and aristocrats continued to oppose and to calumniate, the country, under the influence of their principles and measures, received an impulse which has carried it forward with a rapidity and success unparalleled in the history of our race, and, what is more, the tranquillity, morality and religion which have adorned and blessed American society, for the last forty years, have conclusively demonstrated the consistency Jeffersonian Democracy with the safeguards of social order, the benign principles of the Christian faith, and the exemplary practice of the purest morals. This very experience, it is, which has brought about the change of opinion to which we have adverted; it completes the vindication of the men of 1800. [Cheers.]

Fellow-citizens: In the midst of the abuse and slanders by which we are assailed; in spite of braggart threats and frantic prophecies of victory to others and defeat to us; yea, even when appearances may seem to be against us, let us not, for a moment, be discouraged. We stand upon Democratic ground; we stand where the men of 1800 stood; we are their true, their only, their not unworthy successors. They struggled with difficulties far greater than ours; their sky was infinitely darker; and yet they conquered. So shall we, if we are faithful to ourselves and to the principles they bequeathed us; for now, as then, their principles are identified with Truth, and to her belong, not only "the eternal years of God," but, sooner or later, the crown of triumph. [Repeated and long-continued cheers.]

Letter from a well-informed gentleman in Pennsylvania.—No fears for the Keystone State!

"As to our prospect in Pennsylvania, I assure you on my solemn word and honor, that I do not believe VAN BUREN'S MAJORITY WILL BE LESS THAN 20,000. We will beat the rascally Abolition traitors in at least 40 counties out of the 53, and in some of them by heavy majorities. In Berks, for instance, by at least 4,500; in Westmoreland, (our Westmoreland,) by 2,500; in Philadelphia county, by 3,000; Venango 1,000; Northumberland 1,100; Centre 900; York 1,400; Northampton 1,150; Monroe 1,000 (out of 1,200); Bucks 500; (where Harrison, 4 years ago, had 300); Pike 400; Lycoming 1,100; Wayne 350; Cumberland 800; Warren 600; Armstrong and Clarion 1,300; Perry 1,300; Columbia 1,600; Chester 300, (for Harrison before by 500); Schuylkill 980; Fayette 700 to 800; Green 600 to 800; Bradford 200, (for Harrison before); and so on to the end of the chapter. Have no fears of the KEYSTONE! She is "right side up," and will make clean work of the wicked amalgamation of Tories, anti-Masons, Feds., Blue Lights, Abolitionists, and all the other corrupt and corrupting elements of which modern Whiggery is composed. Rely upon it, the enemy has no more chance of carrying Pennsylvania, than they have of going to Heaven without repentance; which, you will confess, would be but a slim chance indeed."

We clip from the Southwestern Virginian the following, to show how far the game of base deception is carried in that part of the State:

"In this Republic of ours, every participant in the elective franchise has the right to know upon what principles the Government is to be administered, and what course of policy is to be pursued by the individual who asks his suffrage, should be to attain the distinction of chief servant of a sovereign people."

Here is a recognition of the right of the people to know the opinions of those who ask their suffrages—a right, which Gen. Harris has once admitted, but now denies; yet this paper, in this hypocritical and shameless manner, thus attempts to make the people believe he had spoken out on all subjects. Gen. H. says he will make no pledges or answer any questions, because, if he did so, the race would not always be with the swift, or the battle with the strong, but with him who could tell the most "LIES." Now, we challenge the Virginian to reveal one single opinion Gen. H. entertains upon any question of leading policy, about which he has not contradicted himself. The truth is, he is nothing but "clay in the hands of the potter." He has not firmness enough to tell the truth, nor the intelligence to avoid self-contradiction. Is such a man worthy the support of high-souled Virginians?

RICHMOND, Va., WEDNESDAY, OCT. 7.

"A wise and frugal Government which shall restrain men from injuring one another; shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement; and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government.—MR. JEFFERSON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

REPUBLICANS OF VIRGINIA!

The Whig calls upon the friends of Gen. Harrison throughout the State, to address the people on the important political topics of the day. This call is dictated by the open, candid and unreserved avowal you have made of your principles at Charlottesville and elsewhere. Meet them at every post and corner in the Commonwealth. Expose their humbugs, their sophistries and misrepresentations. Show to the people, that the party which is afraid to make any avowal of its opinions, is entitled to no credit in a public discussion before them. Ask them for their principles, and hold them to an explicit and well-defined answer. Make them tell the people, what are Gen. Harrison's opinions on the Bank, the Tariff, Internal Improvements, Abolition, and the Assumption of State Debts, &c. Hold up to public ridicule their incompetent and humbug candidate. Dwell upon the insult the Whigs offer the people, in asking them to support Gen. Harrison, because, as they falsely assert, he lives in a log cabin and drinks hard cider. Expose the miserable and deceptive game which is played off on them, in first representing him as a poor backwoodsman, and then ushering him forth in all the pomp and magnificence of family pride and powerful connexions. Never before in our history has any party pretended to ask the people for their votes, without first giving them a declaration of their principles. Such a strange spectacle has been reserved for the Whigs and Abolitionists of the present day. This is the party which dare not meet their opponents in an open field, upon the merits of the principles they avow and maintain in any public manifesto; but, relying on falsehood, mystification, and a bold unblushing denial of the plainest facts, they affect a great regard to truth and justice, by inviting on all occasions, a public discussion. Hear the hypocritical cant of a late number of the Whig of this city:

"We hope to see the whole month of October dedicated to this great and essential work. We hope to see the Presidential question discussed on the hustings of every county of Virginia, at the October courts. This last and universal effort, we demand of the Whigs of Virginia, in the name of their country. This is the way to neutralize Van Buren tactics—to circumvent the whispered lie—to counteract the malicious slander—to arrive at the truth, and—deem the country!"

The Louisville Public Advertiser, in the following article, marks out the course and policy of the Democrats between this and the election. It may be of service, as furnishing a catalogue of the usual charges made against Mr. Van Buren. The objects of the Advertiser can be easily accomplished, without the use of hard names, the proof in each case being ample. The Whigs may not think that a rose by another name will smell as sweet:

"Charge upon Them.—This should be the policy of the Democracy throughout the Union. They should keep up a constant charge upon the vile assailants of the free institutions of the country.

"Charge them with wilfully lying about the expenditures of the General Government—with complaining of expenditures for which they voted, almost unanimously—with proposing expenditures, intending to complain of them when made—and with indirectly giving aid and comfort to the Indians in Florida, for the purpose of harassing the Administration, and increasing the expenses of the war.

"Charge them with piratical conduct, in fighting without daring to raise a common flag, or to avow the principles and policy they wish to establish.

"Charge them with base lying in relation to the expenditures for furnishing the President's House, and suppressing the Speech of Governor Lincoln, (Whig evidence,) which shows, that Congress directed the appropriations complained of, without solicitation or recommendation on the part of the President.—The conclusive Speech of Governor Lincoln has only appeared in one Federal paper in the United States—the Intelligencer—and that print would have gladly been excused from disseminating such a triumphant vindication of the President.

"Charge them with bank subservency—show that subservency, by showing that wherever banks are large lenders to the people, and the people slaves to the banks, Federalism bears sway.

"Charge them with striving to substitute the power of incorporations for that of the people, and demonstrate by the present influence of the banks, that, unless the people arouse themselves, their liberties may be overthrown by bank conspirators. If, when suspended, bankrupt and disgraced, banks can hold hundreds of thousands in bondage, what might they not do, if sound, and conducted by able financiers? They are now in the hands of unscrupulous partisans, and no change for the worse can take place on that score.

"Charge them with base lying about the increase of Executive patronage. This is a complaint Federalists never make in sincerity. If the President were guilty of all they charge upon him, on this point and more, they would rally around him, and proclaim him one of themselves. It is farcical, in a free country, to hear monarchists complaining of the increase of Executive patronage—to hear the advocates of Exclusive privilege—the champions of incorporated credit—hypocritically defending simple government and equal rights.

"Charge them with vile lying about the character of the Independent Treasury bill, and prove the charge by referring to the fact, that since the bill became a law, the Federal papers dare not lay it before their readers, nor can Federal orators venture to read it, in any of the innumerable lying speeches they are delivering.

"Charge them with scandalous lying about the effects the Independent Treasury law would have—such as reducing the prices to the rates now paid in Europe, and utterly prostrating every branch of business. Prices are improving, and business looking up, and exhibiting to the public gaze the Federal leaders, as a dirty set of lick-a-little liars.

"Charge them with corrupt lying about Mr. Van Buren's advocacy of negro suffrage, and his opposition to white suffrage. He advocated the right of every man paying a poll tax, working on a

highway, or being a household r, if a citizen and of lawful age, to vote at all elections, except free negroes, who were required to have a freehold qualification on of the value of \$250.

"Charge them with lying about Mr. Van Buren's opposition to the late war. He was, throughout, a supporter of the late war with England, and every reading Federalist knowingly lies, when he makes an assertion to the contrary.

"Charge them with filthy lying about the Hooe case—the negro testimony, &c.

"Charge them with lying about defaulters—running through 30 years, to take up a list of 60 or 70, and then reading the list as if all the defaulters occurred under the administration of Mr. Van Buren. Such conduct is too base for a blackleg to descend to.

"Charge them with lying for years about the war of the Administration on the credit and commerce of the country. No war of the sort was ever commenced. If, however, the Administration could have made a successful war on credit, it would have done great service to the country. We should have had fewer gentlemen of capital on other people's means.

"Charge them with lying about the currency. If the banks had not suspended to save their pets, we should have had a sound currency. Who wants a better currency than specie? And can there be any lack of specie, whilst the banks redeem their issues in good faith? The truth is, the Federalists are the bankers; they supply the paper currency, and corrupt and depreciate it. They alone are responsible for the present derangement of the currency.

"Charge them with trying to be Harrison into a Democrat and an unequalled hero. Harrison was accused of cowardice in the late war, as the dates of hundreds of his certificates of courage will show, and the charge came from those who were then fighting shoulder to shoulder with Daniel Webster and the Hartford Conventionists. The Federalists are the men who charged their present candidate for President with cowardice. They forgive his omissions of duty to his own country, because he never harmed England intentionally, and now support him, because they think they can use him.

"Charge them with lying about the humbug of a standing army of two hundred thousand men, to an extent sufficient to demoralize a million of souls here, and damn them hereafter. On this subject, more reckless villany has been displayed than was ever exhibited in any political contest since the formation of the Federal Government. No Federalist has spoken upon it, without uttering wilful falsehoods without stint.

"Charge them with warring upon the purity of the press, the purity of elections, and the rights and liberties of the people. Without any thing like a common or national flag, they are, like pirates, assailing the dearest rights of the people, and rely for success—of altogether on hard cider, but hard lying, bribery, intimidation and corruption. It is the last desperate effort of the most profligate set of men that ever took the position of office-hunters in this or any other civilized country. Americans! If you respect yourselves or value your liberties, trample the varlets in the dust. Show them that you cannot be deceived by such mercenary, corrupt, brazen-faced liars."

DEMOCRACY IS VIRTUE.

Carefully and studiously as the Whig orators and Whig presses attempt to disguise and deny the fact, yet all intelligent men of either party know, that the true ground of opposition to the Administration is, that its principles and practices are too Democratic, too favorable to strict equality of rights and privileges.

Harrison was nominated solely by Northern Whigs; men, notoriously the friends and advocates of a latitudinous construction of the Constitution, of a Bank, the Tariff and Internal Improvement; measures calculated to enrich one part of the community at the expense of another, and especially burdensome and injurious to the South.

No sentiment ever more strictly accorded with common honesty, common sense and true Democracy, than that of Mr. Van Buren, wherein he rebuked the prevailing spirit which looks to Government to make or to mend men's private fortunes, and said, (we do not quote literally,) that "Government should interfere as little as possible with the industrial pursuits of the citizen." Yet, nothing that he ever did or said, has excited such a storm of obloquy and vituperation.

A very little reflection will convince every one, that Government is not and cannot be a money-making machine; that it engages and can engage in no productive labor whatever; that, when best administered, it must be a tax, though a necessary tax, on the industry of the people. Every body of common sense knows, very well, too, that there is no political or legislative ledger-deman that can make money; that nothing but labor can make money, and nothing but economy can amass it. It is a corollary which none but a knave or a madman will dispute, that when the people generally are indebted, individual economy and industry and nothing else, will pay the debt; that in such case, the single duty of Government is, to protect each man in the enjoyment of the products of his own labor—taking care, that the strong and unprincipled idler does not reap the harvest sowed and matured by the weak and honest laborer.

All these truths, the Whigs understand as well as we do. But they also know another very important truth, which they always act on, but never profess: "That Government, though powerless to make money, is a most efficient, time-honored and approved engine to transfer money; that legislation can transfer money faster than industry can make it, and that it is folly to labor, when you can get a charter, a Tariff, or other exclusive privilege, which enriches you at once from the labor of other people."

It is the men holding these doctrines, and continually practising on them, too, who nominated Harrison, and who form the controlling power of the Opposition. We need not go into a discussion of the nature of a Bank, the Tariff, and Internal Improvements, to show, that they are measures calculated to improve the pecuniary circumstances of a part of the community only. Not being laborers, but the mere creatures of law, they cannot create or make money. They can, therefore, benefit one set of men only, by transferring

to them a portion of the products of the labor of another set. That such is their well understood effect, sectional advocacy of them and sectional opposition clearly demonstrate. Democracy everywhere opposes them, because it is her cardinal principle to give every man his due, and never to tax one set of men for the benefit of another.

The Southern Whigs, whose principles accord entirely with that theory of Government which authorizes these measures, found no insurmountable obstacle in their interests to the Harrison nomination. The success of Harrison would go far to canonize that fashionable State legislation, which of late years has made a few speculators suddenly wealthy, encumbered the States themselves with debt, and embarrassed the community. Should the General Government, under his auspices, become an engine for taxing the South, for the benefit of the North, these Whigs flattered themselves, that the same doctrines carried out, would convert the State Governments into machines for enriching the favored few at the expense of the unprivileged many. On the other hand, they feared, that the re-election of Mr. Van Buren would bring his doctrines into vogue, and that special privileges might become as rare as black swans.—They knew he had voted but for one bank charter in his life, and seemed to regret that. Hence, the Whigs North and South joined in the grand chorus of war against "the credit system; black broth and low wages." Col. Taylor, in his *Arator*, lays down the proposition, "that the natural division of parties is of those who live by their own labor on the one side, and those who live by the law on the other." Such is precisely the division of parties at present. The Whigs, or rather the controlling power of Whiggism, is seeking to give a direction to legislation, State and Federal, that shall fill their own pockets from the hard earnings of the mass of the people, whilst the Democrats are resisting this attempt, resolved to confine Government within its legitimate and constitutional bounds—that of affording protection to all, and special privileges to none.

In this war of Privilege against Equal Rights, the Whigs, by concealing their real designs, affecting great sympathy for the poor, and by getting up shows of log cabins and hard cider, have deceived many honest Democrats, who have enlisted under their banner, believing them to be, as they profess, the friends of equal rights. The old Federalists unite with the Whigs on this occasion, not from selfish and interested motives, but because the theories and practices of the Whigs comport with their favorite doctrine of Implied Powers, and will tend greatly to strengthen and consolidate the Government. The same reasons make the army and Navy Whigs; for they, like the Federalists, are rather the advocates of power than of privilege. The Abolitionists are Whigs, because Abolition may well get in at the same rent in the Constitution which lets in the Bank and the Tariff, whilst the strict construction of the Democrats shuts the door on all their mad projects.

To return from this digression. We state as a fact, that there are more laws enacted in the U. States in one year, than in all the rest of the world. Ninety-nine in a hundred of these laws are private acts, granting to certain individuals advantages and privileges not enjoyed by the rest of Society. But it is next to impossible to confer by law privileges on individuals without trenching on the rights of the community. The worst feature in this kind of legislation is, that the honest and industrious are much more rarely the recipients of these legislative bounties, than the cunning and the idle. The virtuous hard-working man has neither time, inclination nor requisite tact for besieging legislative halls, and promoting log-rolling. It is the favorite occupation of the idle and the cunning.

Solomon, in the maturity of his age and wisdom, lamented that

"There is a vanity which is done upon the earth; that there be just men, unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked; again, that there be wicked men, unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the righteous."

Shakspeare, the next wisest man, in view of the same, well exclaimed—

"Some rise by sin, and some by virtue fall!"

Society, when best constituted, must afford frequent instances of such evils and injustice. But it seems to us, that the prevailing Whig doctrines and practices are calculated to promote and aggravate these evils, to reward vice and tax virtue. On the other hand, the Democratic doctrines, (we wish their practice always accorded with their theory,) tend to reward virtue and punish vice, by making industry and economy the only road to fortune, and leaving idleness to starve. All will agree in the abstract proposition, that such should be the chief aim of Government; for, no people can be virtuous, whose institutions encourage vice.

"Quis enim virtutem amplectitur ipsam premia si tollas?"

Will you enlist under the banners of a party in whose ranks your bold confidence, your ardent patriotism, your love of truth and justice will constitute impediments to your progress: when, in lieu of these virtues, you must sedulously cultivate and acquire a spirit of low intrigue and cunning, that "thrift may follow fawning"? Will you not rather join the Democratic party, where your virtues will be a sure passport to success?

It has been generally believed, that the Speeches of Gen. Harrison were the production of his committee, and that he only performed the part of a schoolboy, in committing them to memory, and reciting them to his audience. This belief has of late received confirmation from the fact, that an individual appeared in this city not long since, to testify that General Harrison did actually deliver the Carthage Speech. He says that he was present, took long notes, and knows that the Speech published was the Speech delivered. He did not say whether the committee sent him or not "to testify and the truth to say" in behalf of the General's Speech, leaving that to be inferred as a matter of course. Nor did he take pains to say, that the Speech might not have first been written out by the said committee, and then placed in the General's hands to be memorized. This Carthage Speech was designed by the committee as a master-stroke of policy; but, like all the efforts of knavery and dishonesty, it recoiled upon the heads of the schemers.—It is a pedantic, wish-washy farrago of contradictions and inconsistencies. As usual, it occupies both sides of the fence at the same time. As regards Abolition, he still holds out inducements for those who profess it, to support him, by saying not a word about the District or Territories. He admits the right of discussion and petition to its fullest extent, and hints that societies formed in one State, to discuss the domestic institutions of another, are not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution. He is emphatically the two-sided candidate. Now, Gen. H. well knew, that the Abolitionists generally did not contend for any power in Congress to abolish slavery in the States; but claimed only for that body a right to do so in the District and Territories.—Why, then, did he not come out, if he wanted to satisfy the South, and say it was unconstitutional to agitate the question as regards them? For the simple reason, that he was afraid to offend the Abolitionists, upon whose votes he well knows his chance for the Presidency depends. But, abolish slavery there, and its abolishment in the States must follow, as a matter of course. The Abolitionists and Gen. Harrison know this well. It is policy, therefore, not to go further at present. But let that be done, and a train of evils must ensue, which will drench in blood the fairest portion of the Union. It is impossible for the imagination of man to depict the horrors which must overspread this now peaceful country. Yet, Gen. Harrison, to retain the support of such fanatics, will not repudiate their schemes, or say he will veto a bill to abolish slavery in the District or Territories! Will not the South pause?

The officeholders are the most active and prominent certifiers of Gen. Harrison's claim to public confidence—yet the Whigs are ever prating about their interference in elections. Gen. Gaines has been prevailed on to make his appearance in print, to prove, that General Harrison, "with whom he never fought a battle," is a marvellously brave man and skilful General. So much certifying is so much evidence to our mind, that Gen. Harrison does not, and never did possess the valor and chivalry, for which, for political purposes, his friends are now endeavoring to give him credit. The history of the late war must be blotted out forever, before any credence can be given to the extravagant eulogies now bestowed upon him. Mr. Madison passed him over, in speaking of the "heroes" of the last war—So did Mr. Clay and the National Intelligencer. At Sandusky, he "cut and run"—a favorite expression of our opponents at this time. At Tippecanoe, he was surprised; and had not daylight soon come to his relief, every man would have been lost. For this, a Court Martial would have sentenced him to be shot, as we have understood Gov. Carroll of Tennessee has said. At the Thames, Col. Richard M. and James Johnson did all the fighting.—Harrison consented to Johnson's plans, and when the charge was about to be given, he "cut and run" a mile. A very great General this! But O! he is a good Whig General. He ought not to be General enough to hurt him. If he were any more of a General, he would be a Military Chieftain, and then the Republic would be lost, as the Whigs, with Mr. Clay, have said all along up to a late date. He is a great General with some; but no General with others. We are reminded in this of a story. A boy went to a Tannery, and asked the proprietor if he wanted to buy a dog skin. The Tanner asked, "was the dog fat?" "O yes," said the boy, "fat as mud." "Ah! well, if he was so fat as that, I don't want it—the skin is not good." "Oh, but," says the boy, "come back here. If that's your only objection, it wasn't so d—d fat after all." Just so with the Whigs about Gen. Harrison's military qualifications. If they meet with one who can be operated on by making him a great General, so well and so good; but, if they meet with another, who thought with Mr. Clay in 1836, why he is not such a d—d great General after all. 'Tis in this way the country is duped and deceived by the galley slaves of Whiggery every day. Arouse to the rescue! To the rescue of your country, freemen!

Dawson, Harrison's Biographer, has denied a statement of Gen. Harrison, and called on him to publish his letters in reply to Col. Croghan. The situation of the Whig candidate is highly critical.

The following is a capital hit at the position before the country of the Whig candidate, in refusing to answer questions, whilst he would appear to do so:

"Hallow, boy, ain't you got a daddy living?" "No, but my brothers have!" "What's their names?" "Why, they're both named Bill, except Sam, and his name's Bob! My name's Boozie, but they calls me Boozie, for short! Any thing more to ask?"

Paraphrased, it would read in this wise: "Hallow, Mr. Candidate, you got any principles? No, but my committee have? Well, what are they? All things to all men on all questions, but a Bank, and for and against that. My name is Old Tippecanoe, but they calls me 'Tip,' for short. Any thing more to ask? If so, go to my committee."

The Yeoman is unfortunate in charging the President with uttering "deliberate falsehoods." This charge is predicated on one of the shallowest quibbles in the world. The question of "surplus deposits," raised by the Yeoman to sustain this grave charge, was immaterial to the original design had in view by the founders of the "system." Whether there was a surplus or not for "years after," does not affect the principle laid down by Mr. Van Buren—that was nevertheless true. But the Yeoman is not correct. There always has been a surplus in some form in the Banks due the Government, ever since the connection created by Hamilton. But the Yeoman says the President told this "falsehood" to array the poor against the rich. The Yeoman is difficult to please. That paper has been laboring to prove that Mr. Van Buren was hostile to the poor and laboring classes, and had passed his Sub-Treasury to decrease their wages, &c., and benefit the rich. Now, he is arraying those poor people, whom he hates, against those rich folks he so much loves! What will the people say to such attempts to deceive and mislead them?

"REFORM"

Is inscribed over the door of the "Cabin" of logs in this city. It seems to have been necessary for the party that seeks to turn Mr. Van Buren out of office, to build a cabin, to satisfy the people of this country, that reform is necessary; for, otherwise, they were too ignorant to understand the *modus operandi* by which it was to be effected. This is Federal policy; a policy, which has ever characterized the enemies of the people. To tell them they were friends of the poor, would not be believed; hence, an actual cabin, visible to the naked eye, was necessary to accomplish the object, as they foolishly supposed. But what reform do the Whigs propose to introduce? They have never yet condescended to inform those for whom they make so many professions of attachment. We suppose it is to rebuild a great National Bank to corrupt and bribe members of Congress and Editors of newspapers. The following clue will serve to unravel the idea of log cabin reform:

"In the investigation headed by Mr. Clayton of Georgia, in 1832, it was ascertained, that certain eminent lawyers had received heavy fees from the Bank, and among them—

Henry Clay,	\$17,000
Daniel Webster,	8,000

"On a subsequent investigation, headed by Mr. Tyler of Virginia, it appeared, that a large number of members of Congress were, during the contest between Gen. Jackson and that institution, debtors to the Bank, viz:

In 1830, 32 members were indebted	\$102,162
1831, 39 "	322,199
1832, 44 "	478,039
1833, 58 "	374,766
1834, 52 "	238,586

"To the Editors of the Courier and Enquirer, in New York, the Bank loaned \$52,000; and that paper, having before supported General Jackson, immediately repaid the loan of the Bank.

"To the Editor of the Pennsylvania Inquirer, in Philadelphia, a Jackson paper, the Bank loaned about \$30,000; and it also immediately took the side of the Bank.

"To sustain the National Intelligencer, one of its most influential organs, the Bank loaned to its Editors about \$29,000, without any substantial security for its repayment."

To raise a Tariff to corrupt whole sections of the country, and whole States at a time—to expend money on Internal Improvements for a like object.—Hamilton said, that "purge the English Constitution of its corruption, and it would become an impracticable Government." There are those who believe, that ours is the better Government when most corrupt. This notion is derived from Hamilton, Webster, and that school of politicians. This is what is meant by Whig "Reform."

The Federal Whig majority in Indiana, at the late election, was 8,637, out of an aggregate vote of 117,931—in 1836 was 8,863, out of 73,759. The Democratic gain on the majority is 166, and in the relative vote, 1,287. The gain of the Whigs being 8,803, with a popular vote of 41,281, in 1836, should have been this year 13,446, with a like vote of 62,934. The Democrats, beaten by that number then, with a popular vote of 32,478, should have been beaten this year 14,733, with a like vote of 54,217. We verily believe the Whigs have carried this State and Kentucky by false and foul voting. Where did they get 21,653 more votes this year than in 1836? They forged them.

The Southwestern Virginian says, that all of our Presidents were lawyers, but Gen. Washington, who was a farmer, and adds, that "Gen. Harrison is a farmer." He had better have said "a county court clerk," to register the decisions of "lawyers," Webster and Clay.

THE HUMBURG CONVENTION IN THIS CITY.

On Monday, the great Whig Convention came off in the Capitol square. Extensive arrangements had been made to accommodate a vast concourse of strangers. Knowing as we did the disposition of the Opposition to magnify their gatherings, in the hope thus to operate on the ignorant, we took a retired position, free from all interruption and noise, and counted the whole procession, as it marched down H street, from beginning to end, and we made out 3,366, ALL TOLD. Thus have the humbuggers most wofully humbugged themselves.—The great Whig Convention is a failure! They calculated at least, after so much expense and parade through their Club and press of this City, to have mustered not less than 20,000 men. Some even went so far as to say that 50,000 would not surprise them; but, after all, it has dwindled away to the inconsiderable number of THREE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIX, including some boys and citizens of this city, who turned out, and they were not a few. We do not believe that there were of bona fide voters more than 1500 or 2000. We expect to increase our majority by that amount, in this State, in November, in consequence of this miserable attempt to bamboozle and humbug the people of Virginia. We are sustained by three or four others in our estimate of the number who joined the procession, and who, like ourselves, took positions favorable to ascertain how many there were.

After the ELITE had entered the Capitol Square and taken their position, the gates were thrown open: we do not know by what authority, (rightful at least,)—they were shut or any Virginian debarred the privilege of visiting the Capitol of his State. We entered carefully and walked up as near as we could get, in order to hear what the orators should say. The crowd being much smaller than we anticipated, we found no difficulty in getting near enough to hear. Governor Barbour first showed himself to the crowd from amidst a shower of banners, and upon a circular balcony jutting out from the Piazza of the Capitol over a part of the crowd. He made some general remarks about the mal-administration of the Government, which, like the sound of an empty barrel, was heard and passed away without leaving any effect behind. Rev. Mr. Plumer, a Presbyterian Minister of the Gospel, then offered up prayer to bless the labors of the Convention for good, we suppose, as we could not hear him distinctly enough to report what he did say. We understand his prayer was appropriate and happy. Then came Benjamin Watkins Leigh, Esq., who, without more than a remark, read what was called an Address to the Convention. We could not hear it, and cared not to do so, as it was already in print, and as we could read it more at our leisure. The most amusing part of this story is, Mr. L. forgot to put it to the Convention for adoption, and retired after reading it. Mr. Barbour immediately stepped forward and exclaimed, with the Address or a pocket handkerchief in his hand, "As many as are in favor of adopting this Address, will say 'aye'; those opposed, will say 'no.' Unanimously adopted," says he, and disappeared in the region of flags. He re-appeared, however, in a moment or so, and after some remarks, introduced Mr. Webster to the company. He came forward, amid many shouts, bowing, and bowing, and bowing. After the excitement which succeeded his debut had subsided, he commenced by putting himself right before a Virginia audience.—He said, it was the first time he had ever been in the Capital of Virginia, and that, though he and Virginians might differ on some matters, this was no time to adjust that difference; that he as well as they, had a common enemy to oppose—an enemy, with the thousand arms of Briarens, and that they should unite at least to put that enemy down, and never cease, till they had forced him to capitulate, or take to flight. He then charged Mr. Van Buren with a disposition to increase Executive patronage, though he argued to show in his Worcester Speech, that Gen. Jackson had lopped off all power from the Federal Government, in opposing a Bank, Tariff and Internal Improvements; a policy pursued by Mr. Van Buren. He complimented Madison, Jefferson and Virginia politicians generally, and said, that he did not know whether he differed with Mr. Madison in his Resolutions of '98 and '00, or not. A man, who has pursued the course Mr. Webster has, to stand up before the very people whose interests and whose principles he had so steadily and uniformly opposed, and say he did not know whether he differed with Mr. Madison in his celebrated Resolutions or not, must either be beside himself or deem those to whom he addresses such language as incapable of understanding him. Did not Mr. Webster oppose the war and endeavor to prove Mr. Madison a liar in the reasons he assigned for it? Are not the Resolutions of '98 in every particular opposed to the declaration of principle made by Mr. Webster in his speech in favor of the Proclamation? Those Resolutions were designed to embrace a National Bank within their inhibition. They inculcated a strict construction of the Constitution. In all these points Mr. Webster has shown himself opposed to Mr. Madison; yet he comes to Virginia and gravely asserts that he does not know whether he is opposed to those

Resolutions or not, and endeavors to prove himself a State Rights man. He touched upon the army bill, as he called it, the Sub-Treasury and the New Jersey case, neither of which would he argue, he said, though he took care to present them in such a light as to excite all the prejudice he possibly could against the Administration. He charged the Administration with hostility to State Rights in opposing the assumption of State debts, and said a good deal, we think, beneath Mr. Webster's character as a man of intelligence and candor. We, however, thought it not extraordinary that a man of Mr. Webster's political principles should endeavor to make out as good a case as he could for his clients, the Barings of London, and lecture the Administration upon the subject of State Rights, that he might prepare the minds of his jury for an assumption of the State debts, and thus at the same time secure the object nearest his heart—a consolidated Government. Mr. Webster was unsparing in his denunciations of Mr. Van Buren's administration; but never said one word as to what system of policy Gen. Harrison would bring with him, in case he was elected. He said not one word of his qualifications or of his political principles. His arguments were all old and common-place from beginning to end. Mummery—mummery and "mum" as to principle. He did say that "Congress had no power, either direct or indirect, to interfere with the institution of slavery;" but said not a word about the District or the right of petition. He said no more on this subject than Arthur Tappan or Garrison would have said, had they been addressing a Virginia audience, as it were, under duress. In conclusion, the Mogul of Federalism has confessed in the Capitol of Virginia, and in compliment to the Democratic principle which he has been opposing all his life, that he is a Jeffersonian Republican! Tell it in Gath! Daniel Webster has renounced his Federalism, and the broad pennant of Democracy now hangs over the whole Union!

Mr. Webster concluded about 2 o'clock, when a recess was asked for by Gov. Barbour, for the purpose of refreshments. In the evening, W. S. Archer, Esq., addressed the assemblage unheard but by a few, and that few appeared indifferent to what they did hear. Mr. Webster again took the stand, after Mr. Archer had concluded, and from his violent action, and the shouts of the crowd, we suppose gave a loose rein to the spirit of invective and the force of denunciation. This he was no doubt encouraged to do by Mr. Archer, who hailed him as the true friend of the South, in his opening observations.—Mr. Webster distrusted the propriety of his visit here. He knew he had opposed the South on Abolition. He knew, that his State contained one of the most fiery Abolitionists in the U. S., in the person of J. Q. Adams. He knew that Marcus Morton, the Democratic Governor of his State, had vetoed a law passed by his (Mr. Webster's) political friends in the Legislature, authorizing the solemnization of marriages between the blooming damsel of the South and the curly-headed, flat-nosed African. Hence, when he came here, he doubted the result; but, when Southern men crowded him with honors and hailed him, under these circumstances as their champion, he let loose to his passions, and played the part of a demagogue. Rejoice, slaveholders, that you have found such a friend!

Note.—Mr. Rives addressed the Convention yesterday, in his usual vein of vituperation. He inveighed against Mr. Van Buren and the Sub-Treasury, with scarcely any regard for decency—he denounced even the worthy and amiable Silas Wright of New York—he abused Mr. Poinsett, and charged him and the President with jugglery and prevarication in the proposition to organize the militia—said his parallel columns, published in the Enquirer, was a base and palpable imposture, but failed to point it out—said not one word in defence of General Harrison's views on this subject, or any political question! His speech was long, ill-tempered, violent—doing, even in the estimation of the Whigs, more injury to them than the Administration. We heard an high-minded intelligent Whig say, that he had but two drops of Loco-Focoism in his whole system, and they were an uncompromising aversion to Wm. C. Rives, (a man, who, he believed, would betray his Lord for 30 pieces of silver,) and a high regard and admiration for the talents, character and purity of Silas Wright of New York.

A new thing under the Sun!—Yesterday, Mr. Leigh presented an "Address of the Whig Convention, held at Richmond, on the 5th Oct., 1849, to the People of Virginia." The Address was printed.—This is the first time we have ever known an Address forced down the throats of a Convention, without paying them the compliment of appointing a committee to prepare and report one, and then considering, modifying and deciding upon it themselves. In no other respect is there any thing new in this production. It repeats what we have heard over and over again from the Whig presses. It is, upon the whole, a trite and rapid composition. In its four columns, it scarcely says one word of Gen. Harrison. It passes over his qualifications, his principles, his pretensions, almost with as much indifference as if he were the man in the moon. The omission is wise enough. Where little can be said, little ought to be attempted. In a word, the Whig Address, as a specimen of composition or a political document, is decidedly inferior

to the masterly Address of the Charlottesville Convention.

This Address explain General Harrison's principles? This Convention dare not attempt it. They are like their great candidate, Orator Mum himself. They dare not develop his principles, for fear of offending some of his heterogeneous supporters. Not a word even about a Bank! not one syllable about the dark question of Abolitionism. They are like their Chief. They dare not make any explanations for the public eye. Free People of Virginia, what say ye? Can ye co-operate with a party like this?—Will you consent to be transferred blindfold to such a Veiled Prophet? NEVER.

We understand, that Mr. Webster affected to appear yesterday as confident of Gen. Harrison's getting the votes of all New England, (New Hampshire excepted,) New York, Pennsylvania, &c., as of his living till November next. To show how confident a careful man ought to be in making such a prognostication, we lay before our readers an extract of a letter we received yesterday from one of the best informed and most distinguished men of Pennsylvania, (Oct. 1): "This State is perfectly safe for Van Buren; and if we are to believe the confident assertions of our friends in Ohio, we may make the same prediction in regard to it."

Mr. Jefferson predicted, after his re-election to the Presidency, that the Federalists would "never attempt again to get into power under their own proper name." Little did this great man foresee, that they would attempt to steal into power by even assuming his own name! Yet this most astonishing audacity has been witnessed in this, our own day and generation.—These Federalists would play the part of Banquo's Ghost, and "shove us from our stools."

Mr. Webster.—Those who wish to know what sort of pretensions this "godlike" orator has to the character of a Virginia, Jeffersonian Democrat, will find the problem solved by reading B. F. Butler's masterly speech in Tammany Hall—and the critique of Mr. Webster's Federal doctrines on the theory of the Constitution, from the pen of a State Rights Virginian. The first is on our first page—the last on the last page. We beg every Virginian to read both—and then judge the degree of that modesty, which has brought him to Virginia to teach us our own Democratic Doctrines!

The Whig papers are parading all over the country, a piece showing how "honest John Davis' wife's cake disappeared." It seems that it disappeared in this way: You must first remember, that "honest John" was a Tory in the late war; and when he heard that the Capitol was burnt, gave three cheers for the British. This is the same "honest John" who said, that the poor could be bought like cattle in the market, and then told a lie on Buchanan of Pennsylvania, by representing that he was in favor of reducing their wages. Well, there was, during the last session of Congress, a Whig meeting or festival or something, at Worcester in Massachusetts. It seems, that honest John's wife, to oblige her husband, as all good wives should do, invited as many as 40 or 50 British Whigs to dine with her in their "log cabin." 200, it seems, conceived themselves welcome, if not invited, and presented themselves at the table for rations. How the poor lady managed to feed 200 comorant Whigs out of the ordinary supply for 40 or 50, and that too in a log cabin, we cannot learn; but she wrote of the circumstance to "honest John," who cried, when he read how his "cakes had disappeared." Believing himself a fool, as he said to himself, to cry over spilt milk, he handed the letter to Daniel Webster. He read it and cried. Then "honest John" said to himself he was not as big a fool as he thought he was. So that the whole of this unreasonable and foolish story, which was predicated on Davis's wife's letter, and what Davis said to himself when he read it, has found its way into the papers, and the Whigs are using it to enlist the ladies in behalf of Whiggery, and crack up "honest John" as a very feeling man. No wonder "honest John's cakes disappeared," when a body of Whigs 200 strong, could be so unmannerly and mean as to crowd themselves upon the hospitality of a lady in a "log cabin," in the absence of her husband. The wonder is, that beer, cider, cakes, log cabin, lady and all, had not "disappeared."

It is now pretty generally believed, that the fund-mongers of England and owners there of American State Stocks and U. S. Bank Stock, have contributed large sums towards carrying the elections in this country in favor of Gen. Harrison and the Whigs. Will not the descendants of our poor old sires awake up without the explosion of a magazine or an earthquake?—What! British gold among us, to accomplish what British muskets could not! Americans, wake up!—the Philistines are upon you!

The New Jersey Case in a Nutshell.

The Whigs admit, that there are no grades of membership, and that a man who is not duly elected, has no more right to give one vote, than he has to sit through the session. They also admit, that the certificate of a

Governor is not conclusive of a right to a seat in Congress. But they insist that it is *expedient*, in order to facilitate the organization of the House, that the men having the Governor's broad seal should be admitted to their seats, even if contested—and although in the sequel it may turn out that the contestants are entitled to the seats. They are now endeavoring to raise up a prejudice against the Democratic party, for refusing to surrender what is right and just, for what they say is *HIGHLY EXPEDIENT*. Yes; they are exhausting all their eloquence in denouncing the Administration party for not admitting wax figures on the floor of Congress, in preference to men—though they know that a decided majority of the people of New Jersey are against them. Not to admit the Governor's men, is considered a gross outrage on State Rights and popular liberty; whilst to admit those who have conclusive evidence of their election by the people, is no attack on the rights of the people or their liberties. Their eloquence on the subject partakes pretty much of the sublime and ridiculous, which we cannot better explain than by publishing some specimens of a kindred character. A member of the Indiana Legislature, gave vent to the following, on a bill to encourage the killing of wolves:

"Mr. Speaker—The wolf is the most ferocious animal that prowls in our Western prairies, or runs at large in the forests of Indiana. He creeps from his lurking place at the hour of midnight, when all nature is locked in the silent embrace of Morpheus; and ere the portals of the East are unbarred, or bright Phoebus rises in all his golden majesty, whole litters of pigs are destroyed."

To which this may be a parallel:

"The sun was just lifting his radiant head above the fleecy clouds of the morning; the feathered songsters of nature were warbling their sweetest carols, when Mary, more beautiful than Diana, walked forth—to feed the chickens."

MAINE ELECTION.

Not so bad after all!—There is scarcely a doubt but that Fairfield is elected Governor. The last Globe says, "The Democratic presses of Maine and Massachusetts all concur in stating the majority of the Democratic candidate (Fairfield) over Kent, the Federal candidate, at a little upwards of ONE HUNDRED. The scattering vote may defeat an election by the people. In the meantime, the Federal party claim the majority and will continue to do it, as in the case of Morton and Everett in Massachusetts, until the returns are settled by the Legislature."

"Our friend, the Hon. Albert Smith, late Democratic Representative of Cumberland District, writes us from ^{PORTLAND}, Sept. 30, 1840.

"My district, which was the focus of the operations of the party, and the point to which the exertions of the Boston Aristocracy were mainly directed, and where their money was expended, I was beaten by only 70 votes out of 13,000; and this result was brought about by the aid of 100 negro votes. What a glorious victory for the Whigs of the South! A MEMBER OF CONGRESS ELECTED BY THE ABOLITIONISTS AND NEGROES. The latter held the balance of power at the late election! But we are not disheartened; we shall relax no nerve, spare no effort to meet our opponents in November. We now understand their movements better, and can better counteract them. I am nearly exhausted in the conflict, but I fight on my stumps to the last. From all parts of the State the news borne upon every breeze is, 'WE CAN AND WE WILL.' I most religiously believe that we shall triumph gloriously in the election of Democratic Electors."

Extract of a letter from L. STEINROD, Esq., Member of Congress of Virginia, dated

CANTON, (Ohio) September 24.

"A great meeting was held here to-day—15,000 people were here. Col. Johnson, Allen, Tappan and Starkweather were all on the field. Col. Allen made the greatest speech I ever heard in my life. He has now addressed one hundred and fifty thousand people since the adjournment of Congress; and you will hear the announcement of the result of his unexampled labors in the thunders of victory from this State on the 13th of October next. I assure you, Sir, we will carry this State, and I do not believe there is a doubt of it."

Extract of a letter from Dover, N. H., Sept. 29.

"I see by a late paper of yours that you put Maine as doubtful.—If you were acquainted with all the circumstances in the late election, I am confident you would come to a different conclusion. I am in that part of New Hampshire bordering on the State of Maine, and am sure that the Democratic party did not suppose the Federalists and Abolitionists were to muster their whole forces; but they were mistaken, for every thing was done by the Feds, that possibly could be, while the Democratic party had more than 3000 votes absent from the polls; but the Democracy are rallying, and you may depend we shall carry the State for Van Buren by a handsome majority, and no mistake."

□ We are authorized to announce, that Messrs. Francis E. Rives and John M. Botts will address the people of Petersburg, on the 15th inst., and of Hanover, on the first day of their County Court, touching the political questions involved in the pending Presidential canvass.